the Secretary to the Diwan is equally magnanimous and generous. But the three together, they assume an impersonal personality and become what is called the Government which has no heart. There is a chemical combination of charcoal, saltpetre and sulphur. Individually it is alright; but when put together becomes gun powder, which is highly explosive. This appears to be something like that. Therefore I say let not the Government adopt all these methods of investigations. Let not the Government lay down any hard and fast rule. Let us try to be a little generous. We all know that the draught has been very general. Even supposing that there are a very few undeserving cases that should not stand in the way of a general remission. I repeat rather than allow the innocent persons to be punished it is always better to ignore a few guilty persons. Once more appealing to the generosity of the Government I press this resolution to a division.

The resolution was put and carried.

Resolution No. 2.

Setting up of practice by Retired Chief Court Judges.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon.— My resolution is this, "*That this Council recommend to the Government that in future no permanent Judge of the Chief Court should be allowed to practise at the Bar on retirement.*" Sir, this resolution is long overdue. I do not think it requires any speech from me to commend the resolution to this House. This is what is obtaining in British parts. The only thing I want you to consider is the position of a junior officer when a retired judge appears before him as a vakil. This officer would have gone for his favour many a time and he appears before the court as a party. As human nature is what it is, some sympathy would be shown to favour him. I do not want to go on in this strain because it is known to everybody. It is not very decent as well. I simply recommend this proposition for the acceptance of the House.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Sir, I rise to second this resolution and, in doing so, I wish to make one or two observations. When they retire, these Chief Court Judges get a reasonable pension. Nobody would say that the bar is not fully represented and there is a paucity of members of the legal profession without them. They are placed on a footing of inferior position by a person who has wide experience and also because of his financial position he is able to compete on unfair terms with the beginner. In these courts there is no fixed line of demarcation

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

between a junior and a senior. Even a gentleman of 30 years practice will take up a small cause case thereby barring the practice of struggling juniors.

Secondly, it is very difficult for a presiding Judge to treat one who has been sitting by his side for a long time, but sitting for the time in the bar, with indifference, however much a Judge may be conscientious and however much he would like to be impartial. Certainly he may show a little more consideration to one who has been a colleague than one attached to the bar. The pension given to him is meant for his old age. He should be protected by a generous Government; that is the meaning of the grant of pension. I cannot understand why a person who receives pension should be allowed to carry on pratice. If he is fit to carry on practice he does not deserve the pension. In many countries there are fixed rules that a person who has been a Judge of the Chief Court or High Court should not practice in the very same court. At least he must have this restriction that one who has sat on the Bench shall not appear before that Bench in the capacity of a lawyer after retirement.

It offends the dignity of the Court, it wounds the feelings of the juniors. It gives insurmountable obstacles in the way of juniors. I think the system is vicious and should not be allowed. But if this is allowed, the pension should not be given. Both should not be allowed. I whole-heartedly support this resolution.

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. കെ. നായർ.— സർ, ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ച് യാതൊരാൾക്കും രണ്ടഭിപ്രായമുണ്ടാകുവാൻ മാർഗ്ഗമില്ല. അതിനുള്ള ന്യായം ഈ പ്രമേയത്തിലുണ്ട്. എന്റെ അറിവിൽപെട്ടിടത്തോളം ബ്രിട്ടീഷ് കോർട്ടിൽനിന്ന് ഇങ്ങിനെ അനുവദിയ്ക്കുന്നുണ്ടെന്നു തോന്നുന്നില്ല.

ഡാക്ടർ എ. ആർ. മേനോൻ.— ഹൈക്കോർട്ടിൽ അനുവദിയ്ക്കുന്നുണ്ട്.

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. കെ. നായർ.— അവിടെ അതിന് ഒരു സംഗതിക്കുടിയുണ്ടെന്നാണു തോന്നുന്നത്. അവിടത്തെ ഹൈക്കോർട്ടിൽ നൂറു വയസ്സുവരെ ജഡ്ജിമാരായിരിയ്ക്കുവാൻ വിരോധമില്ലെന്നു നിശ്ചയമുണ്ട്.

ഡാക്ടർ എ. ആർ. മേനോൻ.— അതുപോലെ ഇവിടേയും വേണമെന്നാണോ പറയുന്നത്?

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. കെ. നായർ.— ഇവിടെ വേണമെന്നല്ല ഞാൻ പറയുന്നത്. ഇവിടെ നൂറു വയസ്സുവരെ എന്നുവച്ചു കഴിഞ്ഞാൽ, ൭൦-ൽ കൂടുതലായി എന്നും വരാം. ശരിയ്ക്കുള്ള വയസ്സ് —ജാതകപ്രകാരമുള്ള വയസ്സ് —ആണെങ്കിൽ നൂറു വരെ ആക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു തരക്കേടില്ല. ബ്രിട്ടീഷിൽ ഇപ്പോൾ ഫുൾ പെൻഷൻ കൊടുക്കുന്നുണ്ടെന്നാണ് ഞാൻ ധരിച്ചുവച്ചിട്ടുള്ളത്.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

തന്നോടൊപ്പം ജഡ്ജിയായിരുന്ന ഒരാൾ വക്കീലാകുമ്പോൾ അയാൾ പറയുന്നത് ജഡ്ജി കേൾക്കുമെന്നുള്ള ധാരണയാണ് മിക്കവാറും ഉണ്ടാകുക. അതുപോലെ തന്നോടൊപ്പം വക്കീലായിരുന്ന പ്രാക്ടീസു ചെയ്ത ഒരാൾ ജഡ്ജി ആകുമ്പോഴും ആ ധാരണതന്നെ ഉണ്ടാകും. മുമ്പ് ജഡ്ജിയായിരുന്ന ആളോട് വക്കീലായിരുന്ന് ജഡ്ജിയായ ആൾക്ക് വളരെ ബഹുമാനമുണ്ടായിരിക്കും. ജഡ്ജിമാരും മനുഷ്യരാണ് —ഇപ്പോഴുള്ള തത്പത്തെ അടിസ്ഥാനപ്പെടുത്തിയാണ് ഏന്റെ വാദം—ഒരാൾ ജഡ്ജിയായി ആ സ്ഥാനത്തിരുന്നുകഴിഞ്ഞാൽ അതിനു ശക്തിയും സ്ഥിതിയും ഉണ്ട്. ആ സ്ഥാനത്തോട് സേവകൊണ്ട് ഒന്നും നടത്തുവാൻ സാധിക്കയില്ല. അതിന് കക്ഷിയില്ല. സാക്ഷാൽ മഹാരാജാവിനു തുല്യമായ ശക്തി ആ സ്ഥാനത്തിനുണ്ട്. ആ സ്ഥിതിക്ക് അവർ അവിടെനിന്നും പുറത്തേക്കു വരുമ്പോൾ അവരും മനുഷ്യരാണെന്നും മനുഷ്യസ്വഭാവം അവർക്കുമുണ്ടെന്നും ഉള്ള കാര്യത്തിൽ നല്ലവണ്ണം ആലോചിച്ചു പെരുമാറേണ്ട കാലം അതിക്രമിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു.

ഇതിനു മുമ്പു കഴിഞ്ഞ സംഗതി പറയാം. ചീഫ് കോർട്ടിൽനിന്നും ഒഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ള ജഡ്ജിമാരൊക്കെ ഇപ്പോൾ പ്രാക്ടിസ് ചെയ്യുന്നില്ലേ? സംഗതിവശാൽ സ്വീയ്ക്കുന്നവരൊക്കെ പ്രാക്ടീസു ചെയ്യും. സാധിക്കാത്തവരാരും അതിനു പോകയില്ല.—എനിയ്ക്കു പ്രാക്ടീസു ചെയ്വാൻ സാധിയ്ക്കുമോ?—ഈ രീതിൽ ഒരു സൗകര്യം അവർക്കു ചെയ്തുകൊടുക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ തീച്ചയായിട്ടും ചീഫ് കോർട്ട് ജഡ്ജിയ്ക്കുള്ള അന്തസ്സും വിലയും നാംതന്നെ കളയുകയാണു ചെയ്യുന്നത്.

സാധാരണ ഒരു നിസ്സാരമായ കേസിനു് ഒരു വലിയ വക്കീൽ വാദിച്ചാൽ ജയിയ്ക്കുമോ? ജയിയ്ക്കുന്നതു കേസിന്റെ ബലംകൊണ്ടാണ്. വക്കീലിന്റെ ബലംകൊണ്ടല്ല.

ചീഫ് കോർട്ട് ജഡ്ജിമാക്ക് ഈ കൊച്ചീ രാജ്യത്തിൽ ശരിയായ ന്യായം നടത്തുവാനുള്ള അധികാരമുണ്ട്. എന്റെ ദൃഷ്ടിയിൽ മഹാരാജാവിനുപോലും ആ ശക്തിയില്ലെന്നാണ് എനിയ്ക്കു തോന്നുന്നത്. അവർ ചെയ്യുന്ന സകല കൃത്യങ്ങളും ഈശ്വരനെ മുൻനിറുത്തീട്ടാണ്. ആ വക ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ അവിടെനിന്നിറങ്ങിവന്ന് വക്കീലായി പ്രാക്ടീസു നടത്തി അവർ മുമ്പിരുന്നിരുന്ന സ്ഥാനത്തിന്റെ നിലയേയും, അന്തസ്സിനേയും മലിനപ്പെടുത്തുന്ന സംഗതി കൊച്ചീ രാജ്യക്കാർ ഇതുവരെ കണ്ടു സഹിച്ചിരുന്നതു വലിയ അന്യായംതന്നെയാണ്. കഴിഞ്ഞ കാലമൊക്കെ അങ്ങിനെ കഴിഞ്ഞു. ഇനി മേലാലെങ്കിലും ഇപ്രകാരം ജഡ്ജി സ്ഥാനത്തുനിന്നും റിട്ടയർഡ് ചെയ്തുവരുന്നവർക്ക് വല്ല സൗകര്യങ്ങളും ന്യായമായി ചെയ്തുകൊടുക്കേണ്ടതാണെന്നു ഗവർമ്മെൻറിനു തോന്നുന്നപക്ഷം, അവരുടെ പെൻഷൻ കാര്യത്തെപ്പറ്റി വേണ്ടപോലെ ചിന്തിച്ചു വേണ്ടതായ സഹായങ്ങൾ ചെയ്തുകൊടുക്കണമെന്നും ഒഴിഞ്ഞുപോയ സ്ഥാനത്തെ നിലനിറുത്തുവാൻവേണ്ടിയുള്ള ഒരു പദ്ധതി സ്വീകരിയ്ക്കണമെന്നുമുള്ള ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ ഞാൻ ബലമായി പിൻതാങ്ങുന്നു.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—Sir, I rise to oppose this resolution and it may be surprising that a member of this profession should stand in the way of curtailing the encouragement that the juniors are legitimately entitled to. But it is not so, if we consider this question from all its aspects. Every one knows that there is no statutory provision anywhere either in the Chief Court or in the High Court preventing a retired judge practising in the same court. To the best of my knowledge such a statutory provision does not exist anywhere. The practice that obtains in Madras is that when a pleader or barrister is appointed to the High Court as a Judge he is asked to enter into an agreement with the Government that he will not practice. That is, an option is given to him to accept the job or not on these conditions and that only when he is accepting a permanent judge's place. That is the reason why Mr. V. V. Srinivasa Ayyangar did not accept the permanent judge's post. What is happening in our State is quite different. We find that the Government Advcoate, after so many years of practice at the age of 50 or 51, gets a chance of being elevated to the Bench of the Chief Court. He can only be there for four or five years and then at the early age of 55 he is prevented from practising. I submit it would be the hardest thing. I may refer to the case of Mr. K. Achyuta Menon who is now practising at the bar. He sat on the Bench as a Judge only for about 2 years and I think that the pension that he is now drawing is a very meagre amount. He is in the full vigour of health but he had to retire at the age of 55. If he is prevented from practising and given only this meagre amount I submit it would be the hardest thing that we can imagine. It is highly necessary for him to maintain his status and dignity. If we insist on judges not practising after they retire from the Bench one or two things have to be done imperatively. For one thing the age limit has to be raised. It is no use asking a set of people with considerable experience of work and knowledge to sit idle for all their life time from the early age of 55.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—What about the other Heads of Departments? They also retire at the age of 55.

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—Their case is different. The judicial experience, as this House is aware, is gained at considerable cost and after a considerable length of time. If you retire the judges at the age of 55, considerable judicial experience and wisdom is simply wasted. In England especially they are life judges. They work there till they attain the age of 70, 75, 80 etc. and sometimes even more. In British India they are allowed to continue up to 60. This House is aware that the White Paper

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

has prescribed the age limit of the Judges of the Federal Court as 62. If the age limit is raised to 60 I will not stand in the way of prohibiting them from practising. But look at the practice here. A lawyer becomes a judge only at the age of 50 or so and he is asked to retire at the age of 55 when he gets no pension. Unless he puts in a prescribed number of years' service he gets no pension.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Why does he accept it?

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—That is not the question. The State requires his services. It is a question of the State asking him to accept the post. It is not a question of the persons hankering for the posts. I therefore respectfully beg to submit that it would be hard to prohibit them from statutory provision from practising. If the House is prepared to accede to the proposition of increasing the age limit.....

Dr. A. R. Menon.—By no means.

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—Or at least giving them full pension whatever may be the number of years they serve on the Bench, I have no objection for this resolution being adopted.

The Hon'ble Member for Pazhayannur said that the Judges are likely to be influenced by the personalities that appear before them. I submit that this is all moonshine. Speaking from my professional experience I can say that such a thing does not happen. I submit it is more an apprehension to say that Judges in these courts are being persuaded because so and so is conducting a case. Such considerations do not enter the heads of our judicial officers. There is no basis for such an apprehension that the case will be decided favourably because a retired judge is appearing. On the other hand if there is any influence coming it is just the other way. Why should I care for him? He has already retired.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—It is equally bad.

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—I am only referring to the other aspect of the question. Such a thing does not exist. It is a mistake to suppose that any such thing will happen. With these observations I oppose the proposition before the House.

Mr. A. Sivarama Menon.—Sir, I hope this House will examine this question from the point of view of principle apart from any personal considerations regarding any of the retired judges who may now be practising at the Bar. The resolution is carefully worded and it seeks to recommend a very healthy principle and in my opinion it deserves the full support of this House.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

In considering this subject we would be greatly benefited if we examine the conditions that obtain in other countries. Some of the Hon'ble Members may know that in England a retired judge does not think of practising after retirement. As far as I know this is not due to any statutory prohibition but is the result of convention that has the same force as written law. The Hon'ble Member for Palluruthy referred to the fact that in England there is no age limit to retiring Judges of the High Court. That is true. There is no rule that a learned judge should retire at a particular age. On the other hand if the Indian rule or the Cochin rule were to be enforced in England she will be deprived of the best judicial talent and experience that today maintain her reputation for strict impartiality and independence in the administration of Justice. Here in India as far as the Highest Court is concerned namely the various High Courts, there was no age limit till recent times. The present rule is that a judge of the High Court should retire when he is 60 years old. That rule was not in existence before. We know for instance that the late Dr. Sir S. Subramania Ayyar of the Madras High Court was not subjected to this 60 year rule. Similarly Sir T. Muthuswamy Ayyar was not. But the 60 year rule has now been introduced as far as the Indian High Courts are concerned and even after the introduction of that rule there is no rule or convention in British India that a retired Judge ought not to practice. We are all familiar with the well-known example of the distinguished jurist and retired High Court Judge Sir V. Bashyam Ayyangar practising at the Bar. I believe our Chief Court had the benefit of his advocacy after retirement.

The feeling is now general that there ought to be a convention in British India that a retired Judge of the High Court ought not to practise at the bar after retirement. This is what happens in British India at the present time. At the time of making an appointment to the High Court Bench an undertaking is taken from the appointee that after retirement he will not practise at the Bar. This becomes a condition of appointment so to speak in as much as anybody accepting a High Court Judgeship has to undertake that, after retirement, he will not practise at the Bar. Now the resolution before the House wants to recommend that system to our State and we have now to give our opinion on the question whether it is a healthy practice to insist on a convention that a retired High Court Judge should not revert to be Bar. I think it will be, on the whole, to the great advantage of the Bar and of the general public if this healthy practice is introduced into our State also. I believe that

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

this rule will not adversely affect any Hon'ble Chief Court Judge who now occupies the Bench.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—Does the Hon'ble Member agree that the age limit here should also be raised to 60 ?

Mr. A. Sivarama Menon.—If that question were before the House certainly I would have expressed my opinion on it. As the question is not now before the House I think it will not be fair on my part to take the valuable time of the House by going into it at present.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—That has a vital connection to the question at issue.

Mr. A. Sivarama Menon.—I don't think it has. No Government can compel a person to accept a judgeship. When the place is offered and accepted with full knowledge of the conditions governing the appointment there is no unfairness whatever in the arrangement. Because a person accepting a judgeship knows full well that after retirement he is not at liberty to practise at the Bar. The only question therefore is whether it is desirable to bring our State in this respect on a par with British India. I think, Sir, it will be taking a right step if this recommendation is accepted as the House will thereby be only accepting a very healthy principle.

Reference has been made to a distinguished lawyer of the Madras High Court who was appointed as a temporary judge when he was about 55 years old. He was asked a little later whether he would accept the post of a permanent judge. He said no because he knew that under the sixty years rule he would have to retire without being eligible to get a pension and at the same time be subject to the disability of not being permitted to practise after retirement. Therefore after being a temporary judge for about two years he refused a permanent place in the Madras High Court Bench and reverted to the Bar. Such things may happen here also. There will therefore be no hardship in the actual working of the rule enunciated in the present resolution and I do hope that the House will place on that resolution the stamp of its approval.

Mr. P. Krishna Menon.—I wish to support this motion not at all mainly on the arguments adduced by most of the members on this side, but in the interests of the retired or retiring Judges alone. But before stating my reasons for that, I must express my thankfulness to the Hon'ble Member for Chittur for giving us a model of looking at questions from an impersonal view as it were, but confining the attention only to the merits of the proposition on principle. As he has very

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

well expressed it, it is not necessary to go into this question with reference to the existing or deceased or probably of persons who may come to occupy the positions hereafter. Here we are confined to the question purely on a matter of principle and if, on principle, we find sufficient reason for adopting it, certainly it is the duty of the Council to accept that resolution leaving the surmounting of difficulties, if there are any, to those who are responsible to get over difficulties. Of course there can be only two parties to the difficulties, namely the Government and the persons who accept the judgeship. As we have seen, the question of acceptance is certainly a voluntary affair and there can be no compulsion whatever put on any person to accept a judgeship. Without mentioning names I am in a position to state that the offer of a judgeship was declined by a person who, knowing that he would not find it convenient or consistent with his dignity to practice at the bar after retiring from the Bench, positively expressed his desire to be excused from the honour that was offered. Therefore I say there is nothing to compel any person to accept it. But if once he accepts it, certainly, he must be ready to conform to the rules which will certainly be conducive to the welfare and dignity of the person as well as of the court from which he has retired. The Hon'ble Member for Palluruthi mentioned the name of a person who is competent to practice and is practising and asked why he should not be allowed to practice as it would be to the advantage of the clients as well as the court. But why didn't my Hon'ble friend allude to the conditions under which he is practising. I am not going to mention them here. But I hope you will remember the position which he occupies even after resuming practice. It may not be possible for all the persons of that class to conform to those conditions, and therefore others will not be following the conditions. Apart from individual cases I only say that it conduces to the dignity of the court from which the person has retired as well as to him, not to expose himself, to borrow the words of other people, to the risk of being victimised or unduly favoured or even being laughed at. Of course without mentioning names, I say I know as a matter of fact, that when a certain gentleman entered the Munsiff's Court, the clients looked rather surprised and then made the remark, "അല്ലാ! ഇവിടെയും എത്തിയോ?". That signifies the attitude which the people assume when such unusual and rare occurrences happen. Therefore without going further into the subject I say that in the interests of those persons themselves this resolution ought to be accepted by the Government. With regard to the other points, as the Hon'ble Member

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

for Chittur has said, there is that convention and people who can afford to accept that convention have accepted that convention and conformed to that rule also. Our honoured citizen, Sir C. V. Ananthakrishna Ayyar, I know, after retiring from the Bench without any pension whatever, is not practising.

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—He cannot practice there.

Mr. P. Krishna Menon.—It is not a question of here or there. It is not a question of practising.

When people accept the honour of the Judgeship, as rightly observed by my Hon'ble friend, they are also prepared to forego the additional advantage of practising after retirement. With these few words, I whole-heartedly support the resolution.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—Will the Hon'ble Member tell me what is the arrangement made with regard to the pension in Madras?

Mr. A. Sivarama Menon.—Pension is apart from this question. The right to a pension depends upon the length of service. In the case of a High Court Judge service for a period of 11 and odd years is necessary for getting the maximum pension. Pension is also prescribed.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—So, there are different rules regulating pension for ordinary service.

Mr. A. Sivarama Menon.—There are special rules with regard to High Court Judges. They are not subject to the ordinary rule of 25 years' service.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon.—May I know from the Government whether they have already issued a rule to the effect?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—Yes.

I do not feel called upon to refer to the opinions expressed by the protagonists or the antagonists of the resolution for the simple reason that the Government have long ago anticipated this resolution and passed proper orders. I did not however want to interfere during the course of the debate for the simple reason that speakers followed their predecessors in quick succession and I could not literally butt in without interruption. I did not want to interfere. I shall read to the Hon'ble Members the order that was passed by this Government on the 27th of January 1932, which I am sure, will satisfy every one of you.

"In supersession of the orders in the Diwan's Proceedings read above, Government are pleased to order that, instead of making a statutory rule, it is sufficient if an undertaking is given by every Judge of the Chief Court, on his appointment, that he will not practise as an advocate in any of the State Courts after retirement from the service.

The above provision will apply to the present Judges also".

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. A. Eachara Menon.—Has it been acted upon?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—This order was communicated to the learned Judges and they are functioning when the order is in full force.

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—Have you taken an undertaking from them?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—We have to consider that the learned Judges are exalted officers. This order was communicated to them and the order contained a special statement that this order is to apply to the existing incumbents also. They are men of honour and they know that they are functioning under this order. The Government have no reason to suspect, and they did not think, that unless a written undertaking was taken they will violate it.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Have you published it?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I don't think there was any objection, but there are so many orders passed by the Government which can be made public without any harm. But it is obvious that it is not possible to publish all such orders. I have read the whole order, not only the relevant portion.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Are we not interested in matters of this kind?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—You are.

Mr. A. Sivarama Menon.—On a point of order, Sir. I submit, Sir, that the question of undertaking or no undertaking is not before the House and we are not concerned with it.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Is it binding only on the permanent Judges?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—The order applies only to permanent Judges. If it is made applicable to the temporary Judges, it will be really hard.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon.—I have only one word to say. The Hon'ble Member for Palluruthy said, "He is only a retired cronny. Why should I care for him". That argument stands in my favour. I am yet to learn what he considers his pastime—Law or Legislature.

Since the purpose of my resolution has already been served, I beg leave of the House to withdraw the Resolution.

Motion withdrawn with the leave of the House.

Compulsory Moral Instruction in Schools and Colleges.

Mrs. Swaris:—Pesident, Sir, it is with great reluctance that I stand up to move this resolution. I became a wounded

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly